

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent telephonic interview held on July 10, 2007. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Applicants also note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the current amendments overcome the *Hendriks* reference.

The Office Action mailed May 4, 2007 considered claims 1, 3-28 and 31-37. Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 17, 21-23, 26-28, 31-32, and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hendriks et al. (US 2003/0163525) hereinafter *Hendriks*.¹²

By this amendment claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 27 and 35-37 have been amended.³ Claims 7 and 30-34 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-28 and 35-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 12, 13 and 35 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to sharing handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of computer users associated with the document. For example, claim 1 defines receiving handwritten annotation data from a first user among a plurality of computer users, each user having annotation access to a public data entry area available to each of the plurality of users, the public data entry area for sharing handwritten annotations received from one or more of the plurality of users with one or more other of the plurality of users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of users. Next, claim 1 defines determining that the handwritten annotation data is public data.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Other claim rejections include the following: Claims 14 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* as applied to claims 13 and 31 above, and further in view of Hendler et al. (US 2002/0042833) hereinafter *Hendler*. Claims 16, 19, 20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* as applied to claims 13 and 15 above, and further in view of Rothrock et al. (US 5,729,687) hereinafter *Rothrock*. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Kloubakov et al. (US 2002/0103708) hereinafter *Kloubakov*. Claims 24 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hendriks* as applied to claim 21 above and further in view of Nakai et al. (US 6,170,016) hereinafter *Nakai*.

³ Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to p. 3, lines 6-15, p. 18, line 5 – p. 19, line 11 and Figures 3 & 4.

Next, claim 1 defines automatically writing the handwritten annotation data of the first user to a public data entry area in response to the determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data. Next, claim 1 defines adding at least one of the plurality of computer users to a list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations. Next, claim 1 defines denying at least one of the plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations. Lastly, claim 1 defines distributing the first user's handwritten annotations to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to the first user's annotations.

Claim 12 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 13 is a computer system claim generally configured to share handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of clients associated with the document. Claim 35 is a method claim generally directed to sharing handwritten annotation data related to one or more pages of a document among a plurality of computer users.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Hendriks describes a method for providing handwritten stroke information to an instant messaging (IM) system (par. [0010]). The handwritten stroke information can show up inline, in the IM message box in real time (par. [0011]). Furthermore, annotations can be scaled up or down to fit in the IM message box (par. [0012]). *Hendriks* also teaches sending a message along with handwritten stroke information to those users that are part of the chat session. Users that are part of a different chat session do not receive the handwritten stroke information. *Hendriks* is silent on distributing the handwritten stroke information to select members within the chat session based on a subscription to a certain user's handwritten stroke information

Thus, *Hendriks* fails to teach or suggest denying at least one of the plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, *Hendriks* fails to teach or suggest distributing the first user's handwritten annotations to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to the first user's annotations, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 12, 13 and 35 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent

claims depend from one of claims 1, 12, 13 and 35, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 11th day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:crb
CRB0000005580V001